

STATE OF MAINE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 2003-113

May 28, 2003

CITY OF LEWISTON WATER DIVISION
Application for Approval of
Issues of Securities (§902)
(\$4,800,000 Bonds)

AMENDED ORDER
APPROVING ISSUES
OF SECURITIES

WELCH, Chairman; NUGENT and DIAMOND, Commissioners

On May 19, 2003, the City of Lewiston Water Division (Lewiston) requested that the Order issued on March 5, 2003 in this docket authorizing it to issue securities be amended to allow the issuance of a total of \$5,315,000 of bonds or an additional \$515,000. In this amended Order, we approve the additional bond issuance.

On March 5, 2003, the Commission authorized Lewiston to issue its bonds in a sum not to exceed \$4,800,000 through Unibank Fiscal Advisory Services, Inc., at an annual rate not to exceed 5 percent. The debt will be paid over a term not to exceed 20 years. Lewiston required these funds for the purposes of constructing a Water Storage Facility at Webber Avenue (\$4,500,000) and for Small Main Replacement (\$300,000). The Commission authorized this issuance by Order on March 5, 2003. Lewiston now plans to issue its bonds in a sum not to exceed \$5,315,000. Lewiston states that it intends to use the proceeds to refund a series of bonds purchased in 1993. Lewiston estimates the projected savings on these refinancing at \$20,277 less issuance costs of \$5,723. The term and interest rate of these bonds will be the same as those previously approved.

Having reviewed the application of the Lewiston, together with data filed in support of it, it is the opinion of the Commission that the proceeds of the issuance of the bonds are required in good faith for the purposes enumerated in 35-A M.R.S.A. § 901. In approving this securities issue, consistent with normal practice and pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 902 (4), the Commission does not imply approval of the District's capital needs or capitalization ratio for ratemaking purposes, nor does this Order limit or restrict the powers of the Commission in determining or fixing any rate.

Accordingly, we

O R D E R

1. That the City of Lewiston Water Division is hereby authorized to sell its bond in a sum not to exceed \$5,315,000 to be used solely for the purposes described in this Order, and at a rate not to exceed 5 percent per year through Unibank Fiscal Advisory Services for a term not to exceed 20 years.

2. That Lewiston report to this Commission, in writing, its actions pursuant to this Order within (60) days of the date of the sale of the proposed bonds, or by July 7, 2003, whichever may come first.
3. That the Administrative Director is hereby directed to mail an attested copy of this Order to interested parties and to close this Docket.

Dated at Augusta, Maine, this 28th day of May, 2003.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

Dennis L. Keschl
Administrative Director

COMMISSIONERS VOTING FOR:

Welch
Nugent
Diamond

NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO REVIEW OR APPEAL

5 M.R.S.A. § 9061 requires the Public Utilities Commission to give each party to an adjudicatory proceeding written notice of the party's rights to review or appeal of its decision made at the conclusion of the adjudicatory proceeding. The methods of review or appeal of PUC decisions at the conclusion of an adjudicatory proceeding are as follows:

1. Reconsideration of the Commission's Order may be requested under Section 1004 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (65-407 C.M.R.110) within 20 days of the date of the Order by filing a petition with the Commission stating the grounds upon which reconsideration is sought.
2. Appeal of a final decision of the Commission may be taken to the Law Court by filing, within 30 days of the date of the Order, a Notice of Appeal with the Administrative Director of the Commission, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(1)-(4) and the Maine Rules of Appellate Procedure.
3. Additional court review of constitutional issues or issues involving the justness or reasonableness of rates may be had by the filing of an appeal with the Law Court, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(5).

Note: The attachment of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the particular document may be subject to review or appeal. Similarly, the failure of the Commission to attach a copy of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the document is not subject to review or appeal.